causation, determinism, and the rest. So far we are agreed. But the human individual can also be viewed as an individual whole, A macroscopic assemblage may be a whole and individualized as such or it may not. Such an assemblage may be a mere mechanical aggregate, without organization, plan or cohesion of the parts *inter se,* In such a case it would be merely a matter for the application of the laws of average and entropy without any pretence to more. Again, it may be a highly organized machine, with parts arranged on a plan to subserve some manufacturing purpose. It would, in view of its organization and unity of plan, have some of the attributes of an individual or a whole, but not to such a degree as to prevent the application to it of the physical laws. Or it may be a highly complex chemical structure which would call for new categories of explanation and thus have even more of the character of a unity without, however, yet escaping the dominion of physical laws. Again, it may attain to a still higher form of organization and unity and may function as a living thing, with a system of internal physiological control, and with a wholeness such as no mere physical or chemical body ever possesses. Finally, it may become still more highly organized, with an intelligent internal self-control which can, within limits, initiate or inhibit the functioning of the body or its parts, with conscious purposes and ideals which determine the routine of behaviour ; and it may thus possess a complex wholeness and centralized self-direction such as mere

animals never attain to. We see in this rising scale of types a continually deepening character of individuality. The assemblage departs farther and farther from the character of an aggregate, a mere physical average, and develops a steadily increasing intensity of individual